REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1, 7-9 and 15 are independent claims. Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 2, 4-6, 10 and 12-14 contain allowable subject matter.

In view of the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Claim Objection

In the Office Action, claims 2, 4-6, 10 and 12-14 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent from including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 9 are allowable in view of the following remarks. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection for claims 2, 4-6, 10 and 12-14, which depend from allowable claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, 7-9, 11, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 5,910,792 issued to Hansen, *et al.* ("Hansen"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) to be proper, a single reference must disclose every claimed feature. To be patentable, a claim need only recite a single novel feature that is not disclosed in the cited reference. Thus, the failure of a cited reference to disclose one or more claimed features renders the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection improper.

Applicants respectfully assert that Hansen fails to teach all elements of claim 1. Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, an image display comprising:

> a plurality of <u>first electrodes individually formed corresponding to the pixels, a second electrode formed in common with the first electrodes, a plurality of light emitting elements provided between the first electrode and the second electrode</u> and including <u>a light emitting layer</u>, and a <u>plurality of transistors</u> provided corresponding to the pixels and connected between the first electrodes and a power supply voltage line for controlling the current supply to the <u>EL elements</u>;
> . . .
> a display controller for <u>using a current value fed back from the second electrode of the display panel and externally input RGB data to correct a white gray level of the RGB data and generate RGB display data</u>, and for providing the generated RGB display data to the data driver; . . . (emphasis added).

Hansen does not teach such features. Rather, Hansen is directed towards a compensating circuit for "a field emission display." See Hansen, Title, Fig. 4. Thus, contrary to Examiner's assertion in the Office Action, Hansen does not teach "a plurality of light emitting elements provided between the first electrode and the second electrode and including a light emitting layer" where the "first electrodes [are] individually formed corresponding to the pixels" and the "second electrode [is] formed in common with the first electrodes." Further, Hansen does not disclose any transistors, much less "transistors provided corresponding to the pixels."

Similarly, Hansen does not disclose "current supply to the EL elements." As noted above, Hansen is directed to a field emission display, which does not include EL elements.

Finally, Hansen fails to teach "a display controller for using a current value fed back from the second electrode of the display panel and externally input RGB data to correct a white gray level of the RGB data and generate RGB display data." Rather, in Hansen, if there is a difference between a reference current and a current from the sample anode, the difference is converted into a voltage and sent directly to the row electrode and column electrode in Hansen's field emission display. See Hansen, col. 7, lines 3-18. Hansen fails to teach using externally input RGB data along with a current value fed back from the second electrode to

improve display performance. Further, Hansen completely fails to teach generating RGB display data.

The examiner asserts that Hansen teaches using externally input RGB data to correct a white gray level of the RGB data. Applicants respectfully disagree. As described in Hansen, an RGB data signal is used to generate a "long-term average of all the RGB digital data." Hansen, col. 8, lines 44-47. However, this average is merely used to generate a reference current. As described above, if there is a difference between the reference current and a current from the sample anode, the difference is converted into a voltage and sent directly to the row electrode and column electrode in Hansen's field emission display. Hansen does not teach using the externally input RGB data "to correct a white gray level of the RGB data [or to] generate RGB display data." Further, Hansen completely fails to teach generating RGB display data. Accordingly, Hansen fails to teach all elements of claim 1.

Claims 7-9 and 15 contain similar limitations as claim 1. Claim 7 recites, *inter alia*, "a plurality of light emitting elements provided between the first electrode and the second electrode and including a light emitting layer," "current supply to the EL elements," and "current value fed back from at least one second electrode of the display panel and externally input RGB data to correct a white gray level of the RGB data and generate RGB display data." Claim 8 recites, *inter alia*, "using a current value fed back from the second electrode of the display panel and externally input RGB data to correct a white gray level of the RGB data and generate RGB display data." Claim 9 recites, *inter alia*, "a display controller for using a current value fed back from an electrode of the display panel and externally input RGB data to correct a white gray level of the RGB data and generate RGB display data." Claim 15 recites, *inter alia*, "using a current value fed back from an electrode of a display panel and externally input RGB data to correct a white gray level of the RGB data and generate RGB display data." As asserted above regarding claim 1, these limitations are not taught by Hansen.

--10--

Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 7-9 and 15, and all the claims that depend therefrom are allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 1, 3, 7-9, 11, and 15.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 2, 4-6, 10, and 12-14 contain allowable subject matter, and assert that claims 2, 4-6, 10, and 12-14 are allowable for depending from claims 1 and 9, which are allowable claims. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 2, 4-6, 10, and 12-14 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: July 19, 2006

H.C. Park & Associates, PLC
8500 Leesburg Pike
Suite 7500
Vienna, VA 22182
Tel: 703-288-5105
Fax: 703-288-5139
HCP/WMH/alj